

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 were presented for examination, and claims 1-8 stand rejected. Claims 1-8 have been canceled, and claims 9-44 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 9-44 will be currently pending in this application, of which claims 9 and 27 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 9-44 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS**Claims 1-8 Rejected**

Claims 1-2 and 5-6 are rejected as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,732,269 to Baskey et al. (“Baskey”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 1-2 and 5-6 are hereby canceled, mooting this rejection with respect to these claims. Claims 3-4 and 7-8 are rejected as unpatentable over Baskey in view of RFC 2616, Fielding et al. (“Fielding”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 3-4 and 7-8 are hereby canceled, mooting this rejection with respect to these claims.

New Claims 9-44

Applicants hereby add new claims 9-44. Claims 9 and 27 are independent claims. Claims 10-26 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 9. Claims 28-46 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of

independent claim 27. Applicants respectfully submit that Baskey and Fielding, alone or in combination, fails to disclose, teach or suggest each and every element recited in new independent claims 9 and 27.

New Independent Claims 9 and 27 Patentably Distinguished over Baskey and Fielding

Independent claims 9 and 27 are directed towards pooling a transport layer connection on a server. These claims recite receiving, by an interface unit, a first request of a first client to access a server and identifying that the interface unit has a second transport layer connection established with the server indicated by the first request. The first client and the interface unit communicating via a first transport layer connection. The interface unit determines that a second client and the server are not transferring data for a second request via the second transport layer connection, and transmits the first request via the second transport layer connection. In response to receiving a third request from the first client or the second client to access the server, the interface unit determines that the second client and the server are transferring data for the second request via the second transport layer connection. In response to the determination, the interface unit establishes a third transport layer connection with the server. None of the cited references, including Baskey and Fielding, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 9 and 27.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Baskey in view of Fielding does not disclose, teach or suggest establishing, by the interface unit, a third transport layer connection with the server in response to determining that the second client and the server are transferring data for a second request via the second transport layer connection. Instead of opening a third transport layer

connection to the server upon determining data for a request is being transferred via the second transport layer connection, Baskey multiplexes client identification information from the SSL protocol via a persistent SSL connection. Fielding, or RFC 2616, merely describes the HyperText Transfer Protocol/1.1. As with Baskey, Fielding fails to teach or suggest opening a third transport layer connection to the server upon determining data for a request is being transferred via the second transport layer connection. Thus, Baskey in view of Fielding fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Baskey and Fielding, alone or in combination, fails to detract from the patentability of independent claims 9 and 27. Thus, Applicants submit claims 9 and 27 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 10-25 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 9, and claims 26-42 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 27. Thus, Baskey and Fielding fail to detract from the patentability of dependent claims 10-25 and 26-42. As such, Applicants submit that claims 10-25 and 26-42 are also patentable and in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the new claims and arguments discussed above, Applicants contend that each of the Examiners rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: May 11, 2007

/CJ McKenna/

Christopher J. McKenna

Registration No. 53,302

Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP

Two International Place

Boston, MA 02110

(617) 248-5000